

IN THE DRAWINGS:

Replace Figs. 11 and 12 with the attached Replacement Sheets.

REMARKS

Claims 1-8, as presently amended, remain herein. Claims 9-12 have been canceled.

Support for amendments to the claims may be found, for example, in applicants' specification at p. 28, line 21—p. 29, line 5.

1. Figs. 11 and 12 were objected to as lacking a "Prior Art" label. Figs 11 and 12 have been amended, mooted the objection. The drawings were further objected to for not showing a "third comparator." Claim 9 has been canceled, mooted the objection to the drawings.

2. Claim 4 has been amended, mooted the objection thereto.

3. Claims 1 and 3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over Murayama U.S. Patent 6,118,295. However, Murayama fails to disclose a capacitance element for detecting a voltage variation of the power supply, as recited in applicants' claim 1. Applicants' specification at p. 28, lines 25—p. 29, line 13 discloses how the capacitor and the semiconductor device detect a voltage variation of the power supply voltage from a reference voltage. Murayama discloses a capacitor connected to a comparator, but fails to disclose a circuit that can detect a voltage variation of a power supply. Since Murayama fails to disclose every element of applicants' claim 1, Murayama is an inadequate basis for rejecting claims 1 and 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

4. Claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Murayama and Dancy U.S. Patent 6,577,109. As discussed above, Murayama fails to disclose every element of applicants' claim 1, from which claim 2 depends. Dancy fails to disclose what Murayama lacks. Dancy discloses a capacitor connected to a comparator, but Dancy fails to disclose a circuit that can detect a voltage variation of a power supply.

Nor would it have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to modify or combine Murayama and Dancy to disclose every element of applicants' claim 2. Neither Murayama nor Dancy contains any disclosure of detecting voltage variations, nor any teaching that would have motivated one of ordinary skill to modify or combine Murayama and Dancy to disclose detecting voltage variations. For the foregoing reasons, Murayama and Dancy are inadequate grounds for rejecting claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

5. Claims 4-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Murayama and Massie U.S. Patent 6,271,650. As discussed above, Murayama fails to disclose every element of applicants' claim 1, from which claims 4-6 depend. Massie fails to disclose what Murayama lacks. Massie discloses a power supply with a reset, but Massie fails to disclose a circuit that can detect a voltage variation of a power supply.

Nor would it have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to modify or combine Murayama and Massie to disclose every element of applicants' claims 4-6. Neither Murayama nor Massie contains any disclosure of detecting voltage variations, nor any teaching that would have motivated one of ordinary skill to modify or combine Murayama

and Massie to disclose detecting voltage variations. For the foregoing reasons, Murayama and Massie are inadequate grounds for rejecting claims 4-6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

6: Claims 7-9, 11 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Murayama and Venema. Claims 9, 11 and 12 have been canceled, mooted the rejection thereof. As discussed above, Murayama fails to disclose a capacitance element for detecting a voltage variation of the power supply, as recited in applicants' claim 7. Venema fails to disclose what Murayama lacks. On the contrary, Venema discloses a measuring system connected to a power supply.

Nor would it have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to modify or combine Murayama and Venema to disclose every element of applicants' claims 4-6. Neither Murayama nor Venema contains any disclosure of detecting voltage variations, nor any teaching that would have motivated one of ordinary skill to modify or combine Murayama and Venema to disclose detecting voltage variations. Further, Murayama and Venema are not in the same field of invention. Murayama discloses a device for detecting power in a power supply. Venema discloses a device for generating a rectangular wave using two capacitors with different capacitances. One of ordinary skill would not combine a device for detecting power with a device for generating a square wave to render obvious applicants' claim 7. For the foregoing reasons, Murayama and Venema are inadequate grounds for rejecting claims 7 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

7. Claim 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Murayama and Park U.S. Patent 6,229,775. Claim 10 has been canceled, mooted the rejection thereof.

Accordingly, all claims 1-8 are now fully in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is respectfully requested. The PTO is hereby authorized to charge/credit any fee deficiencies or overpayments to Deposit Account No. 19-4293. If further amendments would place this application in even better condition for issue, the Examiner is invited to call applicants' undersigned attorney at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

STEPTOE & JOHNSON LLP

Date: December 2, 2008



Roger W. Parkhurst
Reg. No. 25,177
Adam C. Ellsworth
Reg. No. 55,152

STEPTOE & JOHNSON LLP
1330 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036-1795
Tel: (202) 429-3000
Fax: (202) 429-3902

Attorney Docket No.: 28951.1179